THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

20 November 1986

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 16 October 1986 minutes

B. Dates of next meetings:

18 December 1986, 10:00 A.M. (Thursday)

15 January 1986, 10:00 A.M. (Thursday)

Schedule of Meetings for 1987

C. Arlington Cemetery; Report on Memorials

D. Issuance of Coins; Bicentennial of the Constitution; Report

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 20/NOV/86-1, German-American Friendship Garden, the National Mall between 15th and 17th Streets, N. W., along Constitution Avenue. Revision to plans. (See 31 July 86-10)

B. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 20/NOV/86-2 (S.L. 87-26), 701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.; Market Square Project, Western Development. Final design review and presentation of material samples and finishes. (See CFA 11 Dec 85-3)

C. National Afro-American History and Culture Commission

CFA 20/NOV/86-3. Proposed seal for Commission.

D. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 87-13, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Revised concept design. (See O.G. 86-193)

b. Appendix I.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 87-28, 750 17th Street, N.W. Final working drawings. (See S.L. 86-113)

b. Appendix II.

3. Public Space Committee

CFA 20/NOV/86-4, design for a fountain on New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., next to the Saudi Arabian Embassy and the JFK Center for the Performing Arts.

E. Army, Baltimore Corps of Engineers, Arlington Cemetery

CFA 20/NOV/86-5, Arlington Cemetery Visitors Center, pedestrian path lights. Revised design.

PM 12:00 III. INSPECTIONS

Freer Gallery. Inspection of proposed acquisitions.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 87-12	1035 31st Street, N. W. Stuart Mitchell	Remodeling of existing building - Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for remodeling and renovation of existing building as shown in drawings received and dated 22 October 1986. Recommend submission of final working drawings for approval prior to issuance of permit.

O.G. 87-11	1402 31st Street, N. W. Miller residence	Renovation and alteration

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for renovation and alteration as shown in working drawings received and dated 22 October 1986.

O.G. 86-256	3249 P Street, N. W. George Stavropoulos	Two-story addition - Conceptual

ACTION: VOID. Withdrawn by request of applicant and confirmed by letter dated 29 October 1986.

O.G. 87-18	3238 O Street, N. W. St. John's Church	Pedestrian ramp

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed pedestrian ramp and landscaping as shown in drawings received and dated 23 October 1986.

O.G. 87-19	3240 O Street, N. W. St. John's Church	Alteration of doorway

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for alteration of doorway as shown in drawings received and dated 23 October 1986.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 87-15	3600 M Street, N. W. Car Barn	Exterior lighting, flags, sign and clock- Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept designs for exterior elements (lights, flags, clock) shown in drawings received and dated 22 October 1986 provided that those elements occupying public space meet with District Government approval. Illumination should be provided for flagpoles.

O.G. 87-09	3417 N Street, N. W. Wolter residence	Alteration and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed repair work and alteration of front door as shown in drawing received and dated 22 October 1986.

O.G. 86-255	3327 N Street, N. W. Samuel Pardoe	Alteration, renovation and repair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed work shown in working drawings received and dated 1 October 1986. It is noted that all work, except vents, will be confined to the interior.

O.G. 87-14	1357 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. 1357 Associates	Storefront alteration and awning

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed renovation to existing commercial structure as shown in drawing received and dated 22 October 1986. Application includes shed-type awning with lettering over entrance which is also approved.

O.G. 86-253	3721-3749 Winfield Lane, N. W. The Cloisters	Retaining wall

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed stone-veneer retaining wall as shown in drawings received and dated 24 September 1986.

---

20 November 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-254	3044 O Street, N. W. Phillips residence	Inground swimming pool

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed swimming pool, terrace, and alteration to landscaping and fencing. Suggest consideration of replacement landscaping for existing tree which must be removed for pool.

O.G. 87-10	1023 Cecil Place, N. W. Bennett residence	Addition of projecting bay

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Projecting floor-length bay now under construction without a permit is not appropriate in character with the historic nature and small scale of the house or its neighbors. Recommend submission of new design of lighter character (possible use of canted sides) for approval and corresponding alteration of bay in question.

O.G. 87-08	1062 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.	Metal storage shed

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed installation of prefabricated metal storage shed as indicated in submission material received and dated 22 October 1986. Recommend applicant study storage facility, a wood structure, not to exceed height of fence.

O.G. 86-252	3066 M Street, N. W. Earnest A. Antignani	Sign/awnings

ACTION: VOID. Application information incorrect.

O.G. 87-01	2901 M Street, N. W. Citicorp Savings	Signs

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Proposed sheet metal signs and lettering style indicated are not appropriate to this building. Recommend using individually-mounted letters as an alternate example. Recommend some other form of lighting in place of existing gooseneck lamps. Lettering must comply with D. C. Building Code.

---

20 November 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 87-04	1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W. Perpetual Bank	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign replacement as shown in drawing received and dated 16 October 1986.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-12	317 9th Street, N. W. Citicorp Savings	New signs

ACTION: Void. Submission not within CFA jurisdiction. It is under juridiction of Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and should be referred to them.

S.L. 87-09	2121 Park Road, N. W. Rockefeller residence	Garage and storage buildings

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for construction of garage and storage building as shown in working drawings received and dated 21 October 1986. Letter from architect dated 20 October confirms that no changes have been made to approved concept design (see S.L. 86-150).

S.L. 87-08	901 D Street, S. W. Aerospace	Design adjustment

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for revision to existing Building Permit D.C. 406 no. 844AA dated 27 November 1986. Proposed minor changes are required due to existing site conditions and will not noticeably alter approved design.

S.L. 87-14	2121 Park Road, N. W. Rockefeller residence	New tennis court

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new tennis court shown on drawings received and dated 31 October 1986.

S.L. 87-06	409 12th Street, S. W. 12th Street Associates	Design adjustment

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for adjustment of approved design as shown in drawings received and dated 14 October 1986. Revision requires narrowing of proposed building to accomodate scenic easement.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-16	512 3rd Street, N. E. Hancock residence	Fence

ACTION: VOID. Submission location is outside Commission jurisdiction.

S.L. 87-18	2523 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W. New Turkish Chancery	Demolish existing building, construct new building - Conceptual

ACTION: VOID. Submission location is outside Commission jurisdiction.

S.L. 87-21	3101 Woodley Road, N. W. Greenwald residence	Enclosure of existing porch

ACTION: VOID. Submission location is outside Commission jurisdiction.

S.L. 87-24	315 East Capitol Street, S. E. Walsh residence	Garden wall

ACTION: VOID. Submission location is outside Commission jurisdiction.

S.L. 87-10	500 H Street Comfort Inn	Satellite dish

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed satellite dish as indicated on supplemental drawings received and dated 29 October 1986.

S.L. 87-22	4668 Broad Branch Road, N. W. John J. Witmer	New residence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for construction of proposed new residence and landscaping shown in drawings received and dated 5 November 1986. Note correction to design of entrance porch marked in pencil. Erect sample brick and mortal panel on site for approval prior to construction of outer walls.

---

20 November 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-11	1400 G Street, N. W. Citicorp Savings	Signs

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Proposed design and placement of signs are not appropriate to building, nor compatible with general graphics planned for Metropolitan Square. Request coordination between applicant and the retail space manager for Metropolitan Square, John Whalen, of the Carr Company; 202-624-1700.

S.L. 87-23	14 3rd Street, S. E. Folger Library Residential property	New roof

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for replacing existing red terra cotta roof at street-front with slate. Recommend repair or replacement of roofing with materials matching existing.

S.L. 87-27	304 Pennsylvania Avenue, S. E. Victor Rasheed	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new sign consisting of individually-mounted, bronze-anodized, 12-inch aluminum letters. Lighting is not part of this application.

S.L. 87-25	1705 Hobart Street, N. W. Rankin residence	New rear deck and front entrance to basement

ACTION: VOID. Submission location is outside Commission jurisdiction.

S.L. 87-20	201 Massachusetts Avenue, N. E. Diet Center	Sign

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed sign. Signs above the ground floor of multi-tenant building having central entrance would be inappropriate. Request submission of overall sign scheme for entire building. Note: S.L. 87-19.

---

20 November 1986

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-19	201 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Capitol Hill Association	New entrance doors

ACTION: No objection to concept of proposed new entrances. However, before permit approval can be advised, request submission of overall sign scheme for entire building. In particular, the existing HUNAN restaurant signs and canopy do not have a permit and, in fact, far exceed maximum allowable size. Note: S.L. 87-20.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202–566–1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

20 November 1986

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Carolyn J. Deaver Hon. Roy M. Goodman Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Neil H. Porterfield Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue A. Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	George Evans

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings (The agenda order was changed and the meeting dates discussed first.) A meeting on 18 December 1986, as listed on the agenda, was acceptable to a majority of those present, in the event a meeting should be considered necessary during the holiday season. The January meeting was changed from Thursday, 22 January to Thursday, 15 January 1987.

B. Approval of 16 October 1986 minutes. Miss Wolf noted that under Administration, Item I-A, it was stated that her amendments to the minutes for the 18 September meeting would be inserted following the pages on which the corrections were to be made. She asked that, instead, the amendments be inserted into the actual text of the minutes. Under Submissions and Reviews, Item II-A-2-a, page 7, she noted that it had been Mrs. Shannon, not Mrs. Boyd, who had read the ANC report. The minutes will be amended to reflect this. There were no other comments on the minutes and they were unanimously approved as amended. Miss Wolf added that she had never seen corrected copies of the September minutes and would like to see them.

C. Arlington Cemetery; Report on Memorials. The Secretary referred to a draft letter, circulated to the members for their consideration, directed to the superintendent of Arlington Cemetery and inquiring about the number of small memorials that have been erected there without review by the Commission. He asked for the members' comments and said he would send it out with their approval. The members unanimously agreed with the views expressed in the letter, and the Secretary was directed to send it out as written. Exhibits A, A-1, A-2

D. Issuance of Coins; Bicentennial of the Constitution; Report. Staff member Sue Kohler said she wanted to state for the record that, after Congress had passed legislation authorizing the minting of coins to commemorate the Bicentennial of the Constitution, a letter had been sent to Mrs. Pope, Director of the Mint, expressing the Commission's hope that the design of these coins could involve the nation's distinguished sculptors and graphic artists and offering the Commission's help in any way possible. She noted that the letter had previously been circulated to the members. Mrs. Kohler then recalled that the Commission had made the recommendation for a competition in January, and at that time a letter had been sent to then Chief Justice Burger, Chairman of the Bicentennial Committee. She added, for the members' information, that the coins to be issued would be a five dollar gold coin and a one dollar silver coin. Mr. Hart asked if there had been any response and was told that there had not been, as yet. Mrs. Kohler said the legislation had not become law until late in October, and the letter to Mrs. Pope had been written on 4 November.

Miss Wolf commended the Chairman on his letter asking for a competition, and recalling the Mint's frequent protests that competitions are too time consuming, asked to read an excerpt from Don Taxay's The U. S. Mint and Coinage in reference to the time schedule for the Peace Dollar competition of 1921, a competition arranged by the Commission of Fine Arts. In his book Mr. Taxay reported that the artists were not invited to compete until 19 November 1921, leaving them three weeks to submit sketches to the Commission of Fine Arts, and then only four days to complete models for each side of the coin. The final design was approved by the Commission on 17 December, by President Harding on the 19th, and the first coins struck in the first week of January 1922; this was a total of about six weeks from start to finish. Miss Wolf said she thought this would be an appropriate example to point out to the Mint. She added that she thought a limited, rather than an open competition would be preferable in this case, involving the National Sculpture Society or the Society of Medalists, and she thought each competitor should be compensated, with the winner receiving additional compensation for making the models. Mrs. Kohler said she would like to add, in reference to the time frame, that the legislation provided that the coins could be minted beginning 1 January 1987 and continue through 30 June 1988. The members expressed their satisfaction that the letter had been sent, hoped for a favorable response, and thanked Miss Wolf for pointing out that time constraints do not necessarily rule out competitions and excellent design results. Exhibit B, B-1

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 20/NOV/86-1, German-American Friendship Garden, the National Mall between 15th and 17th Streets, N. W., along Constitution Avenue. Revision to plans. (See 31 July, 86-10). Staff member Jeffrey Carson reviewed the July submission of this project, when the Commission did not have a quorum, and recalled that the members present did not object to the design, but did object to the listing of the individual and corporate donors' names in the stone on the garden terraces. They expected to express these reservations to the other members when the project was resubmitted in September. It was not resubmitted at that time, but the letter written to the National Park Service after the July meeting had expressed the members' concerns, which had been echoed by other agencies charged with reviewing the design. Since that time, Mr. Carson said, the Park Service had responded by removing the donors' names, as well as the central plaque and the inscriptions around the pool by Goethe and Jefferson. He introduced John Parsons and David Sherman from the Park Service and James van Sweden, the designer, to discuss the revisions.

Mr. Parsons said that as a requirement of the Section 106 process the project had to be reviewed by the Planning Commission, and the comments made were similar to those of this commission, that the precedent should not be set of allowing donors' names to be inscribed on memorials. [Section 106 is part of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966.] He said it had taken several months, but they had now come up with a proposal that would put the donors' names on a scroll in a container buried beneath the garden. The inscriptions had been removed, as had the central plaque, which some had felt gave the impression that the visitor was entering the Washington Monument grounds as part of the German-American Friendship Garden. He said that, as revised, the plans had been approved by the Planning Commission and the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation.

Mr. van Sweden then described the changes. He said the large central plaque would be replaced by two small plaques, one on each side of the garden, along the walks near Constitution Avenue. He pointed out the location on a drawing and said the material would be black granite; there would be an identical dedicatory inscription on each plaque, with the donors' scroll buried beneath one of them. He said there would be two plaques because the garden will be effectively split into two parts by the opening left in the middle. The Chairman asked if there were any other aspects of the garden that needed to be reviewed before the July approval was ratified and the revisions approved. Mr. Carson reminded him that the members at the July meeting had asked that Mr. Porterfield review the plant selection. Mr. Porterfield said that he had done so, and was pleased with the plants selected and the fact that they were low in silhouette and would not interrupt the ground plane to any extent.

The Chairman then asked if there were any comments. Mrs. Alicia Boyd asked to comment on the position of the D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board. She thought it important to note for the record that the Board had found that the siting of the garden on the Washington Monument Grounds would adversely affect the attributes that qualify the Washington Monument as a National Historic Landmark. She said the Board had recommended that another site be found and also that a master plan be prepared for all future development on the monument grounds. She said she feared the German-American Friendship Garden would set a precedent and other nations would want memorials on the grounds.

The Secretary noted the new legislation which would exclude most commemorative work from the monumental core, and Mr. Hart asked if there had been any specific legislation authorizing the Friendship Garden. Mr. Parsons said there had not been, but Congress had established the German-American Tricentennial Commission, which had proposed the garden. In answer to Mrs. Boyd's comments on the need for a master plan for the monument grounds, he said there had been a plan, approved by this Commission in 1983 but put aside later when the Commission disapproved a further development of it. On this plan had been shown a floral display at the 16th Street access to the grounds, similar in nature to the present proposal. Given these facts, the Department of the Interior had assumed that it would be proper to site the Friendship Garden where the floral display was shown on the master plan. According to Mr. Parsons, the new memorial legislation mentioned previously would not affect this project. In regard to the disapproval of the site by the D. C. Historic Preservation Board, he said that had been overturned by the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. He said he would enter a letter into the record on that matter. Exhibit C

Mr. Porterfield asked if the Commission had at some time reviewed the site for the garden. The Chairman said that when the Commission had first seen the project,money had already been raised for a garden on that specific site. He said the members had not been pleased with the way the process had worked and had made this clear to those involved. He said the Commission had worked with the Park Service out on the site, and had been able to get the project redesigned and scaled down to the point that it had become an enhancement to Constitution Avenue rather than something on the monument grounds. He agreed that he would not want to see this become a precedent but thought that as redesigned it would be a pleasant amenity.

Senator Goodman asked Mr. Parsons to comment on the idea that the garden might set a precedent. Mr. Parsons said the new memorials legislation would preclude this kind of thing on the monument grounds, adding that while two other nations, Morocco and Israel, had expressed the desire to give memorials, they had been informed that the German-American Friendship Garden could not be considered a precedent. Other

memorials in the Mall/Washington Monument Grounds area were mentioned, including the American memorial to the signers of the Declaration of Independence and a gift from the Japanese government--the cherry trees that ring the Tidal Basin. Miss Wolf felt strongly that the Washington Monument Grounds were uniquely American, and that there were many other areas in Washington where our friendship with other nations could be displayed.

As to the project before the Commission at this meeting, the majority of the members felt it was too late again to question the propriety of the site. The Chairman said he thought it had been made clear that the Commission was not going to allow the Mall area to be filled up with odds and ends, and he assured those present that the Friendship Garden, when built, would not be read as forming part of the monument grounds but as an embellishment along Constitution Avenue.

Mrs. Boyd asked to read for the record the statement of the D. C. Historic Preservation Board disapproving the siting of the garden. The report stressed the importance of the Washington Monument, the powerful effect of the solitary monolith sited on an unadorned grassy knoll, and stated that it would be inappropriate to place a small-scale garden in proximity to it.

The Chairman noted again that the Board's decision had been overturned by the Advisory Council, and Park Service representative David Sherman said the Council had the final say in the matter. Mr. Parsons added that it was not until the donors' names were removed that the Council agreed to approve the garden. Miss Wolf asked what the Advisory Council was; she was told by the Secretary that it was a Presidential council, established by Congress in 1966 to ensure that no federal funds would be spent that would adversely affect national registered landmarks.

Mr. Hart moved that a vote be taken; the motion was seconded by Mr. Porterfield and the revised design for the Friendship Garden was unanimously approved. Exhibit C-1

B. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 20/NOV/86-2 (S.L. 87-26), 701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.; Market Square Project, Western Development Corporation. Final design review and presentation of material samples and finishes. (See CFA 11/DEC/85-3) The Assistant Secretary recalled the Commission's approval of the concept design for this major architectural development, a transition between the Federal Triangle (particularly the Archives building) and the commercial core of the city to the north. He said the development at this point on the Avenue had long been part of the Pennsylvania Avenue plan, and he noted that it also included the Navy Memorial. He said this submission, which included a model, drawings and material samples, would present further refinements to a design concept that

had not changed materially since the Commission had seen it in December 1985. He said the staff had reviewed the working drawings and noted some changes to the roofscape; he showed old and new drawings for the members to refer to during the presentation. He said that should the members approve the final drawings and materials, the staff would recommend that a sample panel of materials be erected on the site so that colors and textures could be inspected in daylight. He noted also that the Commission had expresssed some concern about architectural embellishment and the incorporation of art within the project. Jay Brodie and James Rich from PADC were then introduced, as was George Hartman, the architect, from Hartman/Cox.

Mr. Rich said the project had been approved by PADC's design board and they would be reviewing a full scale mock-up of materials; he invited the Commission to review this mock-up also. Mr. Brodie said he was available to answer any questions, and then Mr. Hartman was asked to begin the presentation. He began with the materials and their location on the buildings, pointing out first that the curved, colonnaded surfaces would be limestone (and glass) from base to cornice; other facades would have a limestone base, textured brick central section and limestone cornice, with the window spandrels made of precast. The residential floors at the top would be textured brick and simulated precast, that is, glass-reinforced concrete, to keep the weight down. Metal railings in that section would be painted, the color not certain at this point. Mr. Hartman said the grilles, sign boxes and storefront trim in the lower section would be bronze. He showed a dark, grey-brown color for the window frames and said the curtain walls behind the colonnades would also be dark in color so that the columns would stand out. Mr. Hart asked if there was any possibility that the free-standing columns might at a later point be changed to pilasters; Mr. Hartman said that would not happen as the columns had already been incorporated into the final drawings.

The Chairman asked Mr. Hartman to comment on the Commission's previous request that sculpture and other embellishments be incorporated into the design. Mr. Hartman said that a lot of work had gone into the design of the architectural embellishments--grilles, railings, hardware--and that the owners had an additional budget for other art work; he asked the owners' representative, Steven Grigg, to discuss this. Mr. Grigg said they had a budget of about $200,000 for art to be placed in the public spaces; this would be in addition to art that tenants might choose to purchase for lobbies and other public spaces. Mr. Hart was interested in what percentage of the total budget would be devoted to art work, and asked what the estimated cost of the building would be. Mr. Grigg said the cost would be $80 million, and Mr. Hartman said that would be about a quarter of one percent. Mr. Hart said he did not think the developer should carry the whole burden of embellishing a building like this, that PADC, the District of Columbia and the federal government should all come up with the incentives to encourage expenditures

for art. He said he thought Washington was a long way behind the rest of the country in this area. Miss Wolf then quoted from the December 1985 meeting transcript, where the total cost had been given as $150 million. Mr. Rich clarified this statement by saying that the actual construction cost would be $80 million, that the $150 million figure included secondary costs such as interest. There was a discussion about various areas in the country having laws stating that a certain percentage of construction costs must be devoted to artistic embellishment. Mr. Rich said there was no such law in Washington and he did not know if one had been seriously considered. Mr. Hart said he thought it should be seriously considered and that no one party should have to bear the entire burden, especially in the nation's capital. The Chairman said that in this case the buildings will be essentially a backdrop for the Navy Memorial, which will be rich in outdoor sculpture, so the addition of other embellishments will not be so critical. Mr. Hart agreed and said he did not want to quibble in this case because he thought the buildings were so well done; he noted, however, that there would be other cases where he would raise the issue very strongly and try to create as much public and critical support as possible.

The Chairman then turned the discussion to the brick sample; both he and Miss Wolf questioned Mr. Hartman about the color, which was darker than either the limestone or precast. Mr. Hartman said he had wanted a color that would relate to both these materials, and especially to the limestone as it darkens with age. The texture, too, was chosen with an eye to color relationsips as the various materials age. Mr. Hartman showed the sample in daylight and the members thought it looked better than it had under artificial light. Mr. Hartman said this was an indication of the importance of seeing the full scale mock-up before making final color decisions. Questioned about the size of the brick, he said it would be standard width, 2¼ inches, but longer--12 inches.

In answer to a question from Miss Wolf, Mr. Hartman said his intent was not to make the buildings look as much like the Federal Triangle as possible, although he acknowledged that the precedent for them was the Archives building, on axis across the avenue. He had previously noted the similarity of the colonnades, with white columns and a dark curtain wall behind. He said that while the buildings would be commercial, related to the commercial core to the north, they would also frame the Navy Memorial and so had to have a certain character, related to the monumental federal buildings they faced. In answer to the Chairman's question, Mr. Hartman said the glass used would be clear, with a special untinted coating to meet energy standards. He also showed a sample of a deep green awning fabric, and the grey granite of the base that it would be seen against. Miss Wolf asked about the pattern of the grillework. Mr. Hartman said it was an old Roman pattern, frequently used by McKim, Mead & White, and the Chairman noted that John Russell Pope had also used it frequently. Mr. Hartman said it was often

seen in interior as well as exterior work. There were no further questions; the members agreed unanimously to approve the final drawings, with final approval for the materials to come after the full-size mock-up was seen. Exhibits D, F

C. National Afro-American History and Culture Commission

CFA 20/NOV/86-3. Proposed seal for Commission. Mrs. Kohler said this commission was charged with development of a plan for the construction and operation of a national center for the study of Afro-American culture; she added that it was an independent agency. She showed the design for the seal, based on the Great Seal, with the initials "NAAC" at the top and the word "Commission" at the bottom. The seal would be used for stationery, announcements, etc. The members had no objection to the use of the Great Seal, but they thought the lettering should be a Classic style, with serifs, in keeping with the character of the Great Seal, and that it would look better to spell out the name of the commission in full, around the edge. This recommendation will be conveyed to the Commission. EXHIBIT E

(Senator Goodman left the meeting at this point.)

D. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 87-13, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Revised concept design. (See O.G. 86-193) The Assistant Secretary said the sole issue here was the window configuration. He recalled that the Commission had recommended in favor of demolition of the building on the site after very careful deliberation and had then reviewed and approved the final design for the replacement building with one stipulation--that the windows overlooking the courtyards of several adjacent townhouse-type buildings, facing Wisconsin Avenue, be reconsidered in the light of removing at least some of them. He showed drawings of the elevation the Commission had seen at that time, reported that the Georgetown Board had subsequently seen a revised design, with the first floor windows removed, and said the members had commented that it would look better if the architect kept the first floor window at the Wisconsin Avenue corner. He said the owners of the townhouses did not think the new design went far enough and suggested that six more windows, those closest to the courtyards, be removed and that the wall be treated simply as a party wall.

Architect Shalom Baranes was then introduced. He said his client's concern about a blank party wall was that he would lose light in some of the offices; he said his personal concern was that a blank wall would

be unattractive when seen from the north, coming down Wisconsin Avenue. Mr. Hart asked if a blind arcade could be used to give interest but still protect the privacy of the town house owners who, after all, had been there first. The existing building adjacent to the houses was discussed and it was pointed out that it, too, had windows facing the courtyards, although it was a smaller building. Mr. Porterfield asked about the use of the courtyards and the townhouses and was told that at present the houses contained both offices and residences, but were likely to be all commercial in the near future. Mr. Porterfield thought the low windows in the new building could be screened by a fence, but the high windows were the real offenders as far as privacy was concerned.

Mrs. Alicia Boyd, a trustee of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, asked to speak. First she announced with regret that the Foundation's president, Wynant Vanderpool, had died; she said he would be succeeded by Chiswell Langhorne, former treasurer. She recalled that Mr. Vanderpool had been strongly opposed to the demolition of the building presently on the site and had written the Commission on this matter. She passed out copies of the D. C. Historic Preservation Board's staff report of 16 April 1986 recommending against demolition, which was adopted by the Board at the May meeting. It was noted that the action of adoption was not reaffirmed at the June meeting, and the Board voted in favor of the demolition permit. Mrs. Boyd discussed this in more detail, and asked Mr. Baranes if he had received the permit; he said he had not but expected to have it that afternoon. Mrs. Boyd then began discussing the problem of getting permission to close an alley adjoining the site to the south. Both the Secretary and the Chairman told Mrs. Boyd that that consideration was not relevant at this meeting; the Commission had approved the project with the exception of the windows on the north facade, and if she had a comment on the windows, they would be happy to hear it, but could not take the time to discuss points that did not pertain to the submission. Mrs. Boyd said the alley closing could affect the massing, and she was interested in that, but she had no comment to make on the windows.

Mr. Baranes returned to the discussion of which windows should be removed from the north facade. He agreed that privacy for the townhouses was an important matter, but he thought that taking out six windows on the second and third floors, as the townhouse owners had requested, would create an unfortunate party wall condition. The Chairman and Mr. Hart both agreed that a blank wall would not be desirable. The Secretary said the staff had a suggestion, and that was to remove the windows in a vertical pattern--the three nearest the townhouses--and leave the ground floor windows in. They could be screened with a fence for privacy but still let some light into the offices. It was agreed by the members and the architect that this would be the way to proceed. Miss Wolf noticed the absence of a window near an abutting wall on the townhouse property and suggested that a window half the width of the others could be placed east of the wall to avoid breaking the rhythm of the window pattern. All agreed this would look better, and with that suggestion the revised concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit F

b. Appendix I. The Secretary said there was an item on the agenda the staff would like to discuss, O.G. 87-11, 1402 31st Street. He said the Georgetown Board had no problem with the revised renovation design, but the adjoining property owners on the north had come in and expressed concern that an underground ventilating shaft might damage the roots of two fine magnolia trees in close proximity to it. He introduced the preservation consultant for the owner of 1402 31st Street, Hyman Myers, to discuss the problem. Mr. Myers pointed out the location in question on a site plan and said his clients were anxious to save the trees and had hired a horticulturist to work with the architects to be sure the pit was placed where it would not damage them. Mrs. Boyd said her foundation had an easement on the property and should have reviewed this item. Mr. Myers said he now realized this and was sure that he could work with the foundation and the neighbors and solve the problem. The Chairman commended him on being able to get the ventilating equipment out of sight. There was no further discussion of this or the other items on Appendix I, and it was unanimously approved.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 87-28, 750 17th Street, N. W. Final working drawings. (See S.L. 86-113) Mr. Carson said this submission was for approval of final working drawings for a building approved in concept in June; he said the architects wanted also to appeal a recommendation made by the Commission at that time that the steel pipe railing at the top of the building be removed. He said that when the staff reviewed the final drawings it was noticed that the railing was still shown, and so the architects had been asked to come in and discuss it. Mr. Carson showed the final elevation drawings as well as those approved in June; architect Arthur Keyes was then introduced.

Mr.Keyes said height limitations prohibited the addition of a solid cornice, which would give the building some weight and finish it off at the top, and so the open pipe railing had been developed; Mr. Keyes said a railing would not be included in measuring height. He said it was purely decorative and had been added to give a little richness and weight to a building where amenities were severely limited by budget constraints. He said the use of iron pipe was repeated elsewhere on the building, and he added that it also recalled the use of a balustrade on the landmark Metropolitan Club building next door.

The Chairman said he understood what Mr. Keyes was trying to do, but did not think it would be accomplished by using a thin pipe railing at the top of a masonry building. Mr. Hart and Mr. Porterfield agreed that the railing looked flimsy, and Mr. Keyes said they had tried a more elaborate design but it had not been acceptable to the client. Mr. Hart asked if a cornice could be designed that would project out rather than up; the Chairman said this had been done successfully on Edward Durell Stone's National Geographic building, although both he and Mr. Keyes

agreed that the precise solution would not work here. Mr. Keyes said he would work on that suggestion and would also try a higher railing with more vertical elements.

The Secretary noted that the drawings were being submitted in anticipation of getting a permit, and he asked the members if they would find it reasonable to approve the construction drawings and hold the railing in abeyance; he said that the Commission would still have to see the materials and could look at new railing or cornice details then. The Chairman said it might even be possible to wait until the building was up and then have a full-scale mock-up. The other members agreed this was a reasonable approach and the construction drawings were unanimously approved with railing or cornice details to be seen later. Exhibit F

b. Appendix II. The Chairman noticed a submission for a satellite dish antenna at 500 H Street, N. W. and asked about it. The Secretary said that originally it had been placed in a very prominent location at the edge of the roof, overlooking Judiciary Square, but the staff had worked with the owners and architect and it had been moved back to a location where it would not be visible. There were no other questions and Appendix II was unanimously approved.

3. Public Space Committee

CFA 20/NOV/86-4, Design for a fountain on New Hampshire Avenue, N. W., next to the Saudi Arabian embassy and the JFK Center for the Performing Arts. Mrs. Kohler said this fountain was a gift, already accepted by the Mayor, from the Saudi Arabian government to the District of Columbia. She showed photographs to clarify its location, at the intersection of New Hampshire and Virginia avenues, and noted also the location, just to the north on a U. S. Reservation, of the statue of Juarez. Then she showed a photograph of a fountain in Jeddah, a grouping of granite cylinders topped with bronze water jugs of traditional Arabian design, from which water would pour into basins below. She said the Saudi proposal was to duplicate this design but scale it down to fit the site. She said the Saudi fountain would be erected on District land adjacent to their chancery building, the former People's Life Insurance Building. She noted the presence at the meeting of Ann Hoey, Administrator of the District's Public Space Maintenance Administration, and Mary Healy, chairman of the Mayor's Citizens Advisory Committee for Neighborhood Beautification. She asked Ms. Healy to give the members some background information on the gift of this fountain.

Ms. Healy said she was a resident of Foggy Bottom, and when the Saudis had moved into their building she had talked to them about the community and asked them to participate in keeping it up. She said they had responded by greatly improving the landscaping around the building.

Later they asked if she thought the District would welcome the gift of a fountain, either near their building or elsewhere. They explained their proposal, a scaled-down version of the Jeddah fountain, and she took the photograph and the proposal, which provided that the Saudis would erect and maintain the fountain, to the District's Department of Public Works, the Foggy Bottom Citizens Association, the ANC and the Ward 2 city council member. Only after all these groups had expressed their approval did she and Ms. Hoey take the proposal to the Mayor. When he said he would be delighted to accept it, the formal offer was made by the Saudi government and accepted. Mrs. Hoey said the District government was now coming to the Commission for approval in principle before any further steps were taken. In answer to the Chairman's question, Mrs. Hoey said the site was about 66 by 85 feet. When he commented that there were several large trees near where the fountain would presumably be placed, Ms. Healy said they had been aware of that and hoped the architect would be able to save them; if not, they would be moved or new trees planted. She said the cost of the fountain was estimated at about $800,000.

The Chairman said he shared Ms. Healy's and Mrs. Hoey's enthusiasm over the gift, and he thought a fountain would be very appropriate in that location. He said he did, however, have some reservations about the specific design elements and asked for the other members' comments. Mr. Hart said he had worked on projects in Saudi Arabia and had done some Koranic studies and so realized the great religious symbolism of water. On the other hand, he said, the vessels had no symbolism and he thought they were the weakest part of the design. Mr. Porterfield said he thought it was always difficult to transport a work of art from one culture and setting to another, and to change its size; he thought it would be best to start from scratch in the design of this fountain, and he thought it could be relevant to Washington as well as relate to Saudi culture. Miss Wolf thought the Classical style and verticality of the Juarez statue should be taken into consideration. The Chairman agreed, adding that a more horizontal mass would also work better with the existing trees and be more neighborly and friendly. In answer to Ms. Healy's question, he said the Commission would be happy to work with the architect on the design. The other members agreed that the site, surrounded by freeways, needed the amenity that would be provided by a fountain, and they were confident that the traditional Islamic gift for handling water elements could produce a handsome and suitable design.

John Parsons, representing the Park Service, asked to comment. He said he wanted to caution the Commission that District of Columbia land was not included in the new memorials legislation recently passed by Congress, and therefore there might be many more such gifts intended for sites on District-owned land. The Chairman said this was good word of caution, but on the other hand he thought there were many places that would be improved by such embellishment.

Mrs. Hoey thanked the Commission for its consideration and said she would like to recognize Ms. Healy publicly for her hard work on this and other beautification projects in the District's neighborhoods. Exhibit G

E. Army, Baltimore Corps of Engineers, Arlington Cemetery

CFA 20/NOV/86-5, Arlington Cemetery Visitors Center, pedestrian path lights. Revised design. The Assistant Secretary recalled that there had been two caveats to the Commission's approval of the visitors center and parking facility: that Mr. Porterfield review a detailed landscape plan, and that new designs be submitted for the pedestrian path lights, something more consistent with the design of both structures than the metal cylinder lights shown in September. He said that Mr. Porterfield had worked with the landscape architect and was now satisfied with the plan; this submission was for a new design for the path light. He showed drawings of the lights to be used in the courtyard at the visitors center, and then the proposed path lighting, a masonry cylinder similar to the metal one submitted previously. He introduced Chris Lethbridge to discuss the new lighting design.

Mr. Lethbridge said the precast cylinders would match the granite used elsewhere in the project and they would be approximately 2½ feet high, set 40 feet on center. He said they were chosen because they were unobtrusive and would not compete with other design elements or with the landscape. They would be used along the paths leading to the bus shelter and to the parking garage.

The Chairman had at the last meeting wondered if something more Edwardian, a metal pole and globe design, would be preferable in view of the design of the central building and its globe fixtures; but, considering the startling effect of seeing these in juxtaposition with the modern design of the parking facility, he agreed that these unobtrusive fixtures would provide a better link between the disparate styles of the garage and the visitors center. Mr. Porterfield agreed, adding that he thought they should be placed within the path, not on the lawn, thus making them almost invisible. Miss Wolf disagreed, saying that too much thought had gone into the other elements of the design to accept this design for the path lights; she thought they bore a strong resemblance to the usual trash receptacle. Mr. Lethbridge said he had not been able to track down the design of the lights in a Rockefeller development that Miss Wolf had mentioned during the September meeting.

It was agreed that the lights were not perfect, especially near the visitors center, but given the difficulty of working with two different architectural styles and keeping the fixtures subordinate, the members thought this was probably the best that could be done and gave the design their approval. Exhibit H

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

III. INSPECTION

Freer Gallery. Inspection of proposed acquisitions. The Chairman and Mr. Porterfield inspected the objects displayed and approved them for acquisition. Exhibit I

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A

November 20, 1986

Dear Mr. Costanzo:

The Commission of Fine Arts is concerned about the growing number of memorials that are being placed in Arlington National Cemetery without any consultation with this Commission. On November 4 the New York Times reported that the most recent memorial proposal, which is yet to be constructed, will mark the common burial of the remains of the seven Challenger astronauts. Earlier there were published reports on a memorial to journalists killed in hostile actions involving U. S. troops, and another memorial apparently to the flyers who were killed in the aborted Iranian hostage rescue, which we only learned about from the article.

Our concern stems not so much from the specific subjects of the memorials themselves and whether or not they belong in Arlington Cemetery, but from the fact that decisions on the design and location of the memorials are being made without the advice and comment of this Commission. This is completely contrary to the history of the Cemetery and of the Commission, which since its inception in 1910 has worked closely with the Army on a host of design questions ranging from the appearance of the headstones to major projects such as the Visitors Center which is just about to get underway.

While individually these more recent memorials may be small when viewed in the context of the entire cemetery, collectively they will make a significant impact. The three memorials I mentioned have all occurred in a relatively short time, and at this rate, were this process to continue, there is a likelihood that the cumulative effect could be seriously detrimental to Arlington Cemetery.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you regarding policies and procedures of the cemetery in this matter. If it would be helpful, I would be happy to have a member of our staff meet with you and at some point soon we would like to follow up with a Commission visit to the cemetery. There are a number of

questions about these memorials in addition to their design and location, and it is something the Commission would like to know more about.

As you know, Congress just enacted legislation tightening up the whole process of erecting memorials in Washington. As a result, there is going to be added pressure to erect memorials in and around Arlington Cemetery, a fact that makes it even more essential that there be a very clearly understood process for reviewing all memorial proposals before they become reality.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown

Mr. Raymond J. Costanzo
Superintendent of Arlington Cemetery
Arlington National Cemetery
Arlington, Virginia 22211

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22211-5003

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

December 2, 1986

EXHIBIT A-1

Office of the Superintendent

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
DEC 5 1986

Mr. J. Carter Brown
Chairman
The Commission Of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Brown:

This is in response to your letter of November 20, 1986, expressing your concern, regarding the erection of memorials in Arlington National Cemetery.

First let me say, that I do very much appreciate the excellent working relationship between The Commission Of Fine Arts and the Army regarding matters affecting Arlington National Cemetery. In the 14 years that I have been associated with Arlington National Cemetery, I have found the advice and guidance provided by the Commission and its staff to be most beneficial and certainly in the best interest of this cemetery and our nation.

Two of the three memorials mentioned in your letter are really not memorials in the truest sense of the word, or at least they were not considered as such by this office.

Unfortunately, the November 4 article in the New York Times described the marker for the common gravesite of the Challenger Crew as a memorial and I can readily understand why the Commission would be concerned at not being consulted. The monument to be erected at the gravesite was designed by the U.S. Army Institute of Heraldry. An artist rendering of the 2 x 3 foot bronze plaque which will be mounted on a 3 x 4 foot granite die has been furnished to Mr. Charles H. Atherton of your staff. There are several hundred similar group burial monuments which have been erected in Arlington National Cemetery since World War II. This office has not, in the past, consulted the Commission regarding group burial markers, however, if it is your desire that this be done, I will most certainly institute such a procedure.

Cemetery regulations permit civic and or patriotic organizations to donate trees to the cemetery in memory of individuals or groups who have died in the service of our country. The regulation also permits these organizations to place a small plaque at the base of the tree. An organization known as No Greater Love donated an oak tree in memory of journalists who were killed as a result of hostile action.

There are approximately 20 similar donated trees planted throughout the cemetery. The practice of accepting these type of trees dates back to 1932. Here again, we have not, in the past, consulted the Commission regarding matters of this nature, but we will most certainly do so if that is your desire.

The plaque memorializing those killed on the Iranian rescue mission was authorized by an act of Congress. The plaque was erected on April 25, 1983. This is indeed a memorial and I do feel the Army erred in not consulting the Commission regarding the erection of this plaque. I do apologize for this serious omission.

I do welcome your suggestion for a member of your staff to meet with me to discuss and clarify the above mentioned matters as well as any other issues that may be of interest to the Commission. Please have a member of your staff contact me so that we can arrange for a mutually agreeable date and time.

Sincerely,

R. J. Costanzo
Superintendent

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A-2

December 31, 1986

Dear Mr. Costanzo:

Many thanks for your reply to our letter inquiring about memorials at Arlington Cemetery. I believe that while it has answered some of our concerns, it would still be useful to get together at some point and I have asked our Secretary Charles Atherton to give you a call and set up a meeting.

Perhaps at a later date the Commission could get over to the cemetery. Although we looked at the site for the new Visitors Center very carefully, we did not have the time to see much else, and I am sure the rest of the members would like to meet you and take in more of Arlington the next time we are there.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Raymond J. Costanzo
Superintendent of Arlington Cemetery
Arlington National Cemetery
Arlington, Virginia 22211

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT B

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

4 November 1986

Dear Mrs. Pope:

I was delighted to see that Congress passed legislation authorizing the minting of coins in commemoration of the Bicentennial of the Constitution. This was high on the list of recommendations we sent to Chairman Burger earlier this year when he asked the Commission to suggest appropriate ways the government could celebrate this important event.

As you can see from our report to him, a copy of which I enclose, the Commission believes this is a great opportunity to tap the creative ability of our distinguished sculptors and invite them to participate in the design of these coins. I can think of no more fitting opportunity to demonstrate the federal government's committment to the highest quality in its art.

Anything we can do to support such an endeavor would be a welcome task. It is our hope that these coins can be truly representative of our very best efforts as a people. The occasion they will celebrate deserves no less.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Donna Pope
Director of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
U. S. Mint
Washington, D. C. 20220

EXHIBIT B-1

Ninety-ninth Congress of the United States of America

AT THE SECOND SESSION

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday, the twenty-first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and eighty-six

An Act

To authorize the minting of coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the United States Constitution.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Bicentennial of the Constitution Coins Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Commission" means the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution; and

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

TITLE I—BICENTENNIAL OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION COMMEMORATIVE COINS

COIN SPECIFICATIONS

SEC. 101. (a)(1) The Secretary shall issue not more than 1,000,000 five dollar coins which shall weigh 8.359 grams, have a diameter of 0.850 inches, and shall contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) The design of such five dollar coins shall be emblematic of the bicentennial of the United States Constitution. On each such five dollar coin there shall be a designation of the value of the coin, an inscription of the year "1987", and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(b)(1) The Secretary shall issue not more than 10,000,000 one dollar coins which shall weigh 26.73 grams, have a diameter of 1.500 inches, and shall contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(2) The design of such dollar coins shall be emblematic of the bicentennial of the United States Constitution. On each such dollar coin there shall be a designation of the value of the coin, an inscription of the year "1987", and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c) The coins issued under this title shall be legal tender as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(d) For purposes of section 5132(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this title shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SOURCES OF BULLION

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary shall obtain gold for the coins minted under this title pursuant to the authority of the Secretary under existing law.

(b) The Secretary shall obtain silver for the coins minted under this title only from stockpiles established under the Strategic and Critical Minerals Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98 et seq.).

DESIGN OF THE COINS

SEC. 103. The design for each coin authorized by this title shall be selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts.

SALE OF THE COINS

SEC. 104. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the coins issued under this title shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the face value, plus the cost of designing and issuing such coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses).

(b) The Secretary shall make bulk sales at a reasonable discount to reflect the lower costs of such sales.

(c) The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins prior to the issuance of such coins. Sales under this subsection shall be at a reasonable discount to reflect the benefit of prepayment.

(d) All sales shall include a surcharge of $35 per coin for the five dollar coins and $7 per coin for the one dollar coins.

ISSUANCE OF COINS

SEC. 105. (a) The gold coins authorized under this title shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities and shall be struck at the United States Bullion Depository at West Point.

(b) The silver coins authorized under this title may be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities, except that not more than one facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike each such quality.

(c) The Secretary may issue the coins minted under this title beginning January 1, 1987.

(d) No coins shall be minted under this title after June 30, 1988.

FINANCIAL ASSURANCES

SEC. 106. (a) The Secretary shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the issuance of the coins authorized by this title shall result in no net cost to the United States Government.

(b) No coin shall be issued under this title unless the Secretary has received—

(1) full payment therefor;

(2) security satisfactory to the Secretary to indemnify the United States for full payment; or

(3) a guarantee of full payment satisfactory to the Secretary from a depository institution whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or the National Credit Union Administration Board.

NATIONAL DEBT REDUCTION

SEC. 107. An amount equal to the amount of all surcharges which are received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this title shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury and shall be used for the sole purpose of reducing the national debt.

PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES

SEC. 108. No provision of law governing procurement or public contracts shall be applicable to the procurement of goods or services necessary for carrying out the provisions of this title. Nothing in this section shall relieve any person entering into a contract under the authority of this title from complying with any law relating to equal employment opportunity.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Vice President of the United States and
President of the Senate.

Advisory Council On Historic Preservation

The Old Post Office Building
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, #809
Washington, DC 20004

EXHIBIT C

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
OCT 29 1986

OCT 24 1986

Mr. Lynn H. Herring
Acting Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

REF: German-American Friendship Garden
Washington Monument Grounds
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Herring:

We have reviewed your letter dated October 21, 1986 and revised plans for the referenced project and are gratified to see that the National Park Service has fully addressed the concerns expressed in our letter of October 7. Removal of all inscribed donor names and quotations, along with relocation and redesign of the dedication stone, will ensure that the commemorative purpose of this landscape feature is subordinate to that of the Washington Monument itself. We therefore agree with your determination that the project, as redesigned, will have no adverse effect on the Washington Monument and Grounds.

In closing, I would like to compliment the National Park Service for the constructive manner in which you responded to the majority of concerns raised by the Council, the Fine Arts Commission, and the National Capital Planning Commission in your redesign of the German-American Friendship Garden.

Sincerely,

John M. Fowler
Acting Executive Director

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT C-1

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

November 27, 1986

Dear Mr. Fish:

During its meeting of 20 November 1986, the Commission discussed final modifications to the proposed German-American Friendship Garden with John Parsons and Dave Sherman of your office and the landscape designer, James van Sweden. The Commission is pleased that the disturbing matter of memorializing private donors has been resolved by placing the names in an underground container. Similarly, it seems reasonable to delete the intended inscriptions from the terraces and replace the commemorative plaque proposed for the Sixteenth Street axis with two smaller plaques set within the lower flower beds themselves. Without commending the garden as a precedent the members now feel the project can be approved as an enhancement to Constitution Avenue.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20240

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT D

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

November 27, 1986

Dear Mr. Berliner:

The Commission of Fine Arts met on November 20, 1986 to review working drawings, final details and material samples for the Market Square project. Jay Brodie and James Rich of the PADC staff and design architect, George Hartman, were present. We note that the project was submitted by both the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and the District of Columbia Government (under provisions of the Shipstead-Luce Act, S.L. 87-26). The Commission approved the design development and has no objection to having the permit issued and construction begun. However, prior to final ordering of materials, we request a sample panel be erected on the site for Commission inspection and approval.

The panel ought to be located so that it can be studied in context with the National Archives and Federal Triangle buildings. The materials should include the buff limestone, brick, and cast stone and mortar. Note is made that the brick approved is standard height and twelve inches long and that the glass is clear. When the sample is ready, please let our staff know and they will arrange an inspection. In the meantime, we thank the PADC staff and the architect for working with us and look forward to seeing this exciting addition to the Avenue under way soon.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Suite 1220 North
Washington, D. C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT E

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

November 27, 1986

Dear Mr. Roberts:

At its meeting on 20 November the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed a design for the seal of the National Afro-American History and Culture Commission. While there was no objection to the use of the Great Seal as the principal motif, the lettering was not approved. It was recommended that the full title of the commission be spelled out, filling the space around the edge of the seal, and that a Classical lettering style, with serifs, be used; this would make the lettering more harmonious with the rest of the design.

We would be happy to take a look at a revised version of the lettering whenever it is ready.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James S. Roberts
Director of Public Participation
U. S. Department of Education
F.O.B. No. 6, Room 1017
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT F

20 November 1986
Old Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce Actions

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-26	701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Western Development	Market Square

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for construction of new buildings shown in working drawings received and dated 12 November 1986. Material sample panel shall be erected on site for inspection and approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. Panel will include brick, mortar, limestone, granite, and cast-stone with appropriate mortar colors.

S.L. 87-28	750 17th Street, N. W. Manufacturers Life Insurance Company	Office building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new building shown in working drawings received and dated 14 November 1986. The applicant has agreed to further study the railing and/or cornice cap of the building. Resulting design will be submitted for review by Commission prior to start of construction. Material sample panel must be erected on site for inspection and approval prior to installation of outer walls.

O.G. 87-13	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Company	Apt/office building

ACTION: Hold. Architect will submit drawing confirming window design as discussed on 20 November 1986.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT G

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

November 27, 1986

Dear Mrs. Hoey:

The Commission was happy to meet with you and Ms. Healy at its meeting on 20 November and to review the proposed design for a fountain on District of Columbia public space adjoining the Saudi Arabian chancery at New Hampshire and Virginia avenues.

We understand that the fountain is to be a gift from the Saudi government to the District of Columbia, and we are delighted with the prospect of a water element at the intersection of these two important avenues. However, the members did have reservations about the specific design shown, a smaller scale copy of an existing fountain in Jeddah. It is always difficult to design for one country and then transport that design to another, and it was thought that the traditional Islamic genius in handling water elements could be expressed in a way better suited to this location in Washington. Also, as the Juarez statue provides a vertical element in the immediate vicinity, a fountain with a more horizontal massing should be considered.

We hope that the large trees on the site can be saved. We note, however, the tremendous improvement the Saudis have made in the landscaping around their building and are confident that they will be sympathetic to the need for similar large-scale planting material in the event the trees must be replaced.

The Commission looks forward to working with you and the architect for the Saudi Arabian government in developing a suitable design for this much appreciated gift.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mrs. Anne Witt Hoey
Administrator
Public Space Administration
Department of Public Works
District of Columbia Government
4701 Shepherd Parkway, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20032

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT H

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

November 27, 1986

Dear Mr. McCormick:

The Commission of Fine Arts met with Mr. Chris Lethbridge on 20 November 1986 to discuss further studies of the pedestrian pathway lights for the Arlington Cemetery Visitors Center. The metal canister-like lights have been replaced with a cast stone version which should complement the granite used in the project. This we feel is a suitable improvement and convey our approval of this last remaining design detail.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick, Jr.
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Engineering
and Construction
Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington, D. C. 20314-10000

FREER GALLERY OF ART
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20560

EXHIBIT I

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
NOV 24 1986

20 November 1986

Mr. Charles Atherton
Secretary
Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Charles:

Enclosed is a copy of the list of objects you and the other members of the Fine Arts Commission approved this afternoon.

I am pleased that you like the gold woven Chinese calligraphy. When we display the scrolls in the Gallery, I will be certain to let you know.

Again, my thanks for coming to the Freer on such a bleak, rainy afternoon.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lawton,
Director

Enclosure

TELEPHONE (202) 357-2104

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Commission of Fine Arts, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles Lang Freer, have examined the following objects:

Purchases for the Collection:

1 Indian metalwork; Mughal; ca. 1650-1700; gold-lined, floral-shaped box; multi-colors; lid.

1 Japanese painting; Edo period, 1615-1868; by Tani Buncho (1763-1840); "Peach Blossom Spring"; hanging scroll; ink and color on silk.

1 Korean pottery; Three Kingdoms period, 3rd-4th century; Kimhae type; jar with combed pattern.

1 Korean pottery; Three Kingdoms period, 3rd-4th century; Kimhae type; jar with handles.

1 Tibetan bronze; 13th-14th century; Prajnaparamita.

1 Indian lacquer; Mughal; pencase, dated A.H. 995 (A.D. 1587).

Transfers from the Study Collection:

1 (Pair) Chinese calligraphy; Ch'ing dynasty, 18th century; k'ossu tapestry; hanging scrolls; gold on blue ground.

1 Japanese painting; Muromachi period, 15th-16th century; "Shokunin Zukushi uta-awase"; handscroll; ink and colors on paper.

1 Japanese painting; Edo period, 17th-18th century; Tosa school;"Shrine Festivals"; handscroll; ink on paper.

Gifts to the Collection:

1 Chinese bronze; T'ang dynasty, 7th century; mirror.

1 Japanese bronze; Heian period, 794-1185; mirror.

1 Japanese painting; Edo period, 17th century; "Battle Scene"; six-fold screen; gold and color on paper.

1 Japanese painting; Edo period, 19th century; by Kusumoto Rin (Shiko), (1781-1850); "Bird on a Branch"; panel; colors on silk.

Gifts to the Collection (continued)

1 Japanese print; Edo period, ca. 1800; by Kitagawa Utamaro (1754-1806); "Gods of Good Fortune Celebrating with Courtesans"; triptych; ink and color on paper.

1 Annamese pottery; 15th-16th century; covered box.

3 Annamese pottery; 15th-16th century; blue and white boxes.

1 Annamese pottery; 15th-16th century; blue and white jar.

1 Chinese pottery; T'ang dynasty, 618-907; bowl.

1 Chinese pottery; Ch'ing dynasty or Republic, early 20th century; vase with motif of birds.

2 Chinese pottery; Ch'ing dynasty, 18th-19th century; small plates with cobalt decoration.

3 Chinese pottery; Ming dynasty, 16th century; small blue and white jars.

1 Chinese pottery; Ming dynasty, 15th-16th century; blue and white bowl.

1 Japanese pottery; Edo period, 17th century; kendi, celadon with Indonesian silver fittings.

5 Thai pottery; Sawankhalok, 14th-15th century; covered boxes.

8 Thai pottery; Sawankhalok, 14th-15th century; boxes with iron decoration.

11-7-86 For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

11-20-86 For the Commission of Fine Arts